

4/28/78 [2]

Folder Citation: Collection: Office of Staff Secretary; Series: Presidential Files; Folder: 4/28/78 [2]; Container 73

To See Complete Finding Aid:

http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Staff_Secretary.pdf

2237

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 28, 1978

Peter Bourne

The attached was returned in the President's outbox and is forwarded to you for your information. The signed original has been forwarded to Stripping for mailing.

Rick Hutcheson

cc: Stripping

LETTER TO MRS. RUSCHE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 28, 1978

To Sue Rusche

Thank you for your recent letter drawing my attention to the tragic results of drug use among children in Atlanta. Overall we have made remarkable progress in this area during the last year. Our efforts to eradicate opium in Mexico and Asia have resulted in a forty percent decline in heroin deaths, amounting to as many as 600 lives saved. Since I determined last year that we should move to restrict and gradually phase out the prescribing of barbiturates, the second major drug killer, deaths from that substance have dropped twenty-seven percent in twelve months. We have an unprecedented new level of cooperation with the Colombian government in our efforts to control cocaine, and just recently we made a joint seizure of 1,700 pounds of cocaine, the biggest ever and amounting to ten percent of the annual amount smuggled to this country.

None of these statistics I know compensate for the tragedy of an individual death of an addicted young person. Dr. Peter Bourne has told me that he met with you during a visit to Atlanta a few months ago, and both he and I share your concern about drug use among the very young who lack the judgement and maturity to avoid becoming victims. I am also personally distressed by publication of the kind of literature which you sent me which is aimed at the young and glamorizes drug use. Dr. Bourne tells me that the program you have started in Atlanta is a model for the rest of the country which he has specifically cited in testimony before the Congress. He also has very high regard for the handbook prepared by Dr. Schuchard.

I want to assure you that the drug problem is one to which, despite our successes, I still attach high priority and will continue to do everything I can to see that it is eliminated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Jimmy Carter". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the word "Sincerely,".

Mrs. Harry Rusche
1436 Cornell Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30306

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 28, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PETER BOURNE

SUBJECT: LETTER FROM MRS. RUSCHE

I am attaching a draft response to Mrs. Rusche. While the problem she raises about magazines aimed at promoting and glamorizing drug use among young people is very serious and concerns me considerably we would have an impossible first amendment problem if we sought to do anything about it.

She mentions my comments in U.S. News and World Report. These I feel were accurate and appropriate. A copy is attached.

PGB:ss

Attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

4-26-78

To Peter Bourne
Prepare brief
reply for me to
sign -

JC

National Health Insurance: What Carter Will Push

Interview With Dr. Peter G. Bourne, Presidential Assistant for Health Issues

A comprehensive plan combining the best of public and private programs is in the works, according to a top White House adviser who outlines major points of the administration's health policy in this interview.

Q Dr. Bourne, how serious is the Carter administration about getting a national health-insurance program?

A Very serious. It is a commitment the President made very early in his election campaign, and it remains one of his major priorities. He is very aware of the financial tragedy that just one serious illness can inflict on a family.

We are committed to sending legislation to Congress before they adjourn this year. This means congressional hearings can begin this year, and we hope for passage of the entire national health-insurance package at an early date.

Q What will be the major components of that package?

A First, it will be universal and comprehensive—phased in over a period of time—and will place emphasis on building on the best elements of the present system.

Second, we must put a lid on the rapid rise of health-care costs. Last year, we submitted legislation on hospital cost containment, and we are optimistic about its passage this year. Cost control is absolutely essential. A national health-insurance program without cost containment would be unacceptable because these costs are growing faster than almost any other area of the economy. One estimate places national health-care expenditures this year at 200 billion dollars, and they continue to grow.

Third, we want passage of national health insurance in a way that keeps to a minimum any new tax burden on the American public. This may well mean maintaining a major role for the private health-insurance industry, which has had long experience in dealing with medical costs. In states where these groups play an intermediary role in the processing of medicaid payments, they have markedly increased the efficiency of the operations. We are looking at several options, but it is fair to say that some kind of place for private insurers looks like a much more viable possibility now than in some plans in the past.

Q What role is there for health-maintenance organizations?

A We want to encourage the growth of health-maintenance organizations, known as HMO's. These institutions have built-in incentives to keep costs low, to limit hospital days to the essential necessary minimum, to eliminate unneeded surgery, and to maintain the quality of care through professional-review systems that monitor the work of physicians who serve the HMO clients.

Q Could HMO's substitute for national health insurance?

A It is unlikely that they will ever be more than one element in a range of ways of getting health care that a patient could choose from.

The most successful HMO's are generally those that rely on block enrollment by employers rather than individual subscribers. Thus they tend to deal with working individuals and their families—usually the most healthy people in the country. HMO's at present are not generally designed to care for high-risk groups such as the indigent and the



Dr. Bourne, 38, played a key role in Jimmy Carter's campaign and now advises the President on medical affairs. The British-born psychiatrist is a former U.S. Army medical officer and has a longstanding interest in drug abuse and treatment.

aged, and those are the groups that increase the costs of health care most substantially. The administration is looking at ways to build in some kind of federal incentive—either through national health insurance or through separate mechanisms—to strengthen the HMO system for these two special population groups.

Q Do you think people are ready for another federal program that will increase payroll taxes even more?

A This has been one of our major concerns from the start. Obviously, no one wants their taxes increased unless it is clear they are getting some direct benefit in return. We don't, however, intend to institute this program overnight and put an inordinate burden on the economy. We're talking about phasing it in over a period of five or more years, but with a clear commitment that it would eventually be comprehensive.

We are certain the nation wants a guaranteed health program. Polls have consistently shown that more than 60 percent of the American people agree that national health insurance is the one area where they would be willing to pay increased taxes. It's an important issue for middle-income people because they are frightened about getting ill, and they are becoming aware not only of the cost but of some very disturbing facts about the quality of health in this country.

Q What kinds of facts do you mean?

A The U.S. comes out close to the bottom on many of the statistical measures of health, such as infant mortality and life expectancy, compared with other industrialized nations which have health-insurance programs. Despite the fact that the U.S. offers many Americans the best medical attention in the world, it is also clear that a fairly significant number of people do not have access to it and are not getting the quality of health care that people in other countries are getting. There is a lack of equity and equal access in our system.

In addition, we have to consider what is going to happen to the quality of health care in this country if we don't get a national insurance plan. Already, medical costs are astronomical—and unless we get them under control, our whole medical-care system is likely to disintegrate in bankruptcy.

Q Do you think that opposition to national health insurance



At the interview: "If we don't get a national insurance plan, our whole medical-care system is likely to disintegrate in bankruptcy."

from organized medical and business groups has diminished recently?

A Yes, there has been a change. We have had support from a surprising number of doctors and from such professional groups as the American Public Health Association.

The medical establishment is simply not as monolithic as it used to be. The American Medical Association, for example, now represents fewer than half the physicians in the country, and the leadership has been very responsive in discussing the problems that exist with the present system. Much of the political strength of the medical community in opposing national health insurance comes from the grass roots—locally based medical societies that are generally more conservative than their national leadership and, I think, less familiar with the economic realities and tough decisions that just have to be made.

Business and lobbying groups increasingly recognize that a national health program is soon going to be a reality, and are more concerned now with making sure that their special interests get a fair shake in any new plan.

As a result, many in Congress do not view a vote for national health insurance as a political liability.

Q What has brought about this change in attitude?

A In the past, many people were misled into believing that national health insurance would result in a radical change that would allow ill persons no flexibility in choosing the type of medical care they wanted or that would promote one health-care-delivery system to the exclusion of all others. They also envisioned it as creating a horrible bureaucratic tangle. Terms like "socialized medicine" were coined to frighten people into opposing programs before they really understood the benefits that would be provided.

National health programs in England, Canada, Germany and other countries have been criticized—but not one has considered reverting to their old system, and the public in those countries seems overwhelmingly satisfied with the improvement in the overall quality of their health that the programs have produced.

We have tried to benefit from their experience and to avoid some potential pitfalls by designing a pluralistic approach that builds on the strengths of the existing private and public systems. We certainly do not feel that a state-run system such as exists in England is appropriate in this country. We simply want to spread the excellent care now available in the U.S. only for those who can afford it to a broader segment of the population without doing anything to damage the good system that already operates.

Q Beyond this specific legislation, what are the broad goals of the administration for the nation's health?

A President Carter has long believed that we should move from the current emphasis on crisis-oriented care to a greater focus on preventive public-health programs.

In part, this is a matter of historical inevitability, by which I mean that we are faced much less with major problems relating to infectious disease, malnutrition or poverty than we were in the past. Now our physical ailments

tend in large part to be those caused by our lifestyles, our environment and our occupations.

The major causes of death and disability in the U.S. today are alcohol, tobacco, poor diet, lack of exercise, automobile accidents, suicide and homicide—all of them basically behavioral problems. If we are going to improve the quality of health, we've got to deal with those problems by changing the way people live through health education.

Q Won't this require a shift in entrenched medical traditions?

A Perhaps. But we think that medicine is already moving away from a preoccupation with technology and toward more of an awareness that if our health-care system is to avoid bankruptcy, we must work to keep people out of the system by effective prevention programs.

Q Have there been any successes in the prevention effort?

A Yes. One of the most spectacular accomplishments is the dramatic decline in deaths from heart disease. In fact, the drop in the death rate in this country in the last five years exceeded the drop immediately following the discovery of penicillin. Much of that is attributable to a reduction of deaths from heart disease. Why did it happen? An intensive education program made people aware of the need to have their blood pressure taken. They're more aware of their diet and their salt consumption. They are getting more exercise, and they recognize the dangers of cigarette smoking. That means fewer deaths.

Q Do you have any specific public-health plans in mind?

A The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is studying a comprehensive program to stress prevention, and Secretary Califano has already initiated a program to alert people to the health hazards of cigarettes.

The administration's interest in prevention is reflected by a program that the President started in Georgia when he was governor. It was called "the killers and cripples program," in which we tried to alert citizens to the 12 major causes of death and disease in the state and to find ways to improve prevention and early detection. They were problems such as hypertension, alcoholism and lung disease. I'm not sure how many lives we saved, but it did reflect the President's philosophical view of what the role of government should be in improving the overall health of the population rather than merely treating disease once it has already occurred.

Q Can you get young people interested in health protection?

A Most attempts to do so have not been very successful. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on programs that focused too much on the negative aspects—saying, "This is a no-no, and you shouldn't do it because you'll die of cancer or you'll become a drug addict."

I think the approach that is most likely to be successful with the younger generation is one that says that living the good life involves living in a healthy way, getting good exercise and not poisoning the body with any number of things.

Q Can this approach ease the serious problems of drug abuse in this country?

A Yes, but it has to be coupled with serious efforts at

controlling the availability of street drugs—heroin, cocaine, PCP—and those diverted from legitimate medical sources: amphetamines and barbiturates.

Q. What kind of progress are you making in this area?

A We have substantially reduced the amount of heroin coming into the U.S.—primarily because of cooperation with the Mexican government to eradicate cultivation of the opium poppy—so that its availability is now at the lowest level in seven years, resulting in a drop in the heroin-related death rate of 40 percent in the last year. We consider heroin the most serious street drug in terms of the health hazards and crime associated with it.

Q. What happens to heroin users who can't obtain the drug?

A A significant number of peripheral users just give up the habit, some turn to other generally safer drugs, and some seek out treatment programs to help end their addiction. Dependency also declines with a gradual and involuntary detoxification among users. This happens because as the supply of heroin goes down, so does the purity of the drug sold on the street, and the heroin dealer simply has to dilute the supply he has available.

Although we can always backslide very quickly, the reduction in the heroin problem has been a major accomplishment for the administration.

Q. How much of a problem is cocaine?

A There is widespread use of cocaine, but it's a much less consequential substance. Unlike heroin, it is not physically addicting, and only a very small number of users become psychologically dependent on the drug.

Its use seems to be concentrated among members of the more affluent segments of society, many of whom enjoy the pleasant high which the drug can induce. These people also tend to employ reasonably good judgment in using the drug.

Our strategy has been to keep the price of cocaine high through stringent law-enforcement measures. We feel if the drug is inordinately expensive, people will not use it in great quantities and will be less likely to get into difficulties with it.

Q. What about PCP—or "angel dust," as it is commonly known?

A This is the single most significant current drug problem, but one that we think may be transient. The word is getting out on the streets about how very dangerous this drug can be.

We are concerned because in many ways it parallels the LSD experience of the 1960s. There may be a lot of people using it who are not familiar with its effects. Angel dust can produce psychotic episodes during which users may commit acts of extreme violence, including murder, and be completely unaware of what they are doing. But we think there is a self-controlling mechanism at work here, similar to the use of speed, or amphetamines, a few years ago. In that case, the term "speed kills" appeared quite spontaneously in the drug culture, and it quickly made people aware of the hazards.

Q. Does the administration still intend to eliminate federal criminal penalties for marijuana possession?

A We favor making it a civil offense for possession of very small quantities of marijuana for personal use. It would be comparable to getting a speeding ticket and a \$100 fine.

We have no intention of changing the criminal penalties for trafficking.

Also, we are talking only about changing the federal law, leaving it up to the individual states to handle the penalties as they feel is appropriate. Ten states, however, have removed criminal penalties for possession. The Drug Enforcement Agency is focusing its efforts on major traffickers, and

most of their cases are against people caught with a ton or more of marijuana. It is just not practical when there are regular seizures now of 100 tons or more in single shipments to be devoting our scarce law-enforcement resource to quantities measured in ounces.

Q. Would you favor regulating marijuana?

A No, this would require legalization, which we strongly oppose. It would lead to major commercialization of marijuana and advertising campaigns pushing its sale. We feel it's not in the interest of society to increase the number of drugs readily available. In fact, we would like to discourage their use. I am particularly concerned about the heavy use of marijuana by teen-agers, which already exists.

Q. Do you advocate use of drugs such as heroin for legitimate medical purposes—for example, the relief of acute pain?

A We have already made that policy change as far as heroin and marijuana are concerned: Heroin may be helpful in affording a high degree of relief to terminally ill cancer patients, and marijuana may be effective in treating glaucoma and in reducing the discomfort associated with chemotherapy.

A drug should be judged solely in terms of its scientific value and not prejudiced because it has been abused in the past. Its value is also related to our feeling that greater humanitarian concern should be given to reducing suffering in the terminal stages of illnesses such as cancer.

Q. Dr. Bourne, do you have any concern that drugs may be overused in the treatment of mental illness and emotional disorders?

A I don't think they are being overused now despite the high number of persons who are taking drugs to control their moods or their mental state. But this is a difficult area in which to make sweeping judgments.

For example, a couple of years ago there were 83 million prescriptions written for Valium, a well-known tranquilizer. One study showed 26 percent of the population had taken some kind of psychoactive drug in the previous month. In the vast majority of these cases, people who take a pill to relieve their anxiety are made more comfortable and effective. If they didn't have the drug, they might turn to alcohol or other more destructive crutches more frequently. And the drugs seem to restore them to normal, functioning existences.

On the other hand, there are people who feel that it reflects a lack of moral fiber; that one should learn to tolerate a certain level of anxiety and that one should not turn to a pill to solve every stress and strain. So it is a vexing philosophical area.

Ideally, we would combine drug use for mental illness with long-term, supervised psychological counseling to help people deal with their environment. Too often, however, the patient doesn't get that kind of service because the pills are much cheaper than long-term psychotherapy, and most people who take minor tranquilizers do not feel they have a mental problem.

Q. What can be done about the problem of people who need mental-health treatment but don't have access to it, or money to pay for it?

A There will never be enough psychiatrists and psychologists for the entire population. Therefore, family physicians, who already see the largest percentage of mentally ill people, should be made aware of the help that they can offer their patients in dealing with emotional difficulties.

Much mental illness results from lifestyle and learning problems that can be overcome easily if they are detected early. Often, if a person can learn to handle interpersonal relationships better, or get along in a job or family situation, his or her mental health can remain in good condition with a minimum of expense and effort. □

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 28, 1978

C
1

Mr. President:

Our plans for statements on the arms sales are as follows:

- (1) At approximately 5:15 pm, Secretary Vance makes a brief statement on our position for the cameras, particularly emphasizing the overall Mideast position. ✓

This statement will be drafted primarily by Warren Christopher. This will help to get our side of it out. ✓

- (2) Immediately following the brief statement, Secretary Vance and/or Deputy Secretary Christopher will do a brief backgrounder. ✓

Rex

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Ceremonial Planting of Cedar of Lebanon Tree
Friday, April 28, 1978

2:15 p.m.

(15 minutes)

South Lawn

by: Marcia Garrett *mg*

I. PURPOSE:

To plant a Cedar of Lebanon Tree on the White House grounds.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS, PRESS:

A. Background:

On December 15 of last year, you met with a group of Arab American leaders. At that time Mr. Paul Corey and Dr. Elias Saadi of the American Lebanese League indicated they wished to present you with a Cedar of Lebanon Tree for the grounds. You accepted their offer, and asked that appropriate arrangements be made at the ideal time for planting.

B. Participants:

National elected directors of the American Lebanese League and spouses, the Lebanese Ambassador and his wife, members of Congress of Lebanese descent, and representatives of other Lebanese organizations (see attached list for specific names).

C. Press:

Open coverage. The ceremony will be filmed to be shown at the American Lebanese League's national convention in May, as well as for television broadcast in Lebanon.

555

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND:

Eighty-five percent of Americans of Arab-speaking heritage are of Lebanese descent. By sponsoring this event, the American Lebanese League is intending to demonstrate that it alone speaks for the American Lebanese community. This is not the case. Many people perceive the ALL as a conservative splinter organization. Senator Abourezk, specifically, is at odds with the group, having been denounced by it on a number of occasions. Although he had originally intended not to come because of their sponsorship of the planting, he has now decided to attend.

Because the ALL is basically right wing and essentially a Christian group, several other people were invited to broaden the representation. These include the Lebanese Ambassador, Najati Kabbani, and his wife, Sausan; as well as Imam Mohammad Jawad Chirri; and Richard Shadyac. Chirri is Director of the Islamic Center in Detroit and represents Lebanese Moslems. Shadyac is a prominent lawyer in D.C. active in American Lebanese affairs.

In making remarks, there should be no reference to the American Lebanese League, and no attempt to endorse one organization over another in terms of representation of the American Lebanese community in this country. Remarks should focus on Lebanon as a country, and our long-standing friendship with it.

There are five Lebanese-American Congressmen (James Abdnor, R.-S.D., Toby Moffett, D.-CT, Mary Rose Oakar, D.-OH, Nick Rahall, D.-WV, and Abe Kazen, D.-TX), and one Senator, Jim Abourezk. Only Abourezk and Oakar will be able to attend; Toby Moffett is sending a representative.

Tree Planting
Page Three

ATTENDEES:

1. Ambassador Najati Kabbani of Lebanon, and wife, Sausan
2. Senator Jim Abourezk
3. Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar
4. Ms. Ann Sense and Cong. Toby Moffett
5. Mr. Richard Shadyac, D.C. attorney
6. Mr. Imam Mohamad Jawad Chirri, Director, Detroit Islamic Center
7. Dr. Elias T. Saadi, Chairman of the Board, ALL
8. Mr. Paul Corey, National President, ALL

The balance are the national elected directors of the American Lebanese League, and their spouses:

1. George Abdallah
2. William Bazzy
3. Marie A. Corey
4. Elias Y. El-Hayek
5. Naomi E. Farrah
6. Victor Farrah
7. George W. Ganim
8. Josephine T. Ganim
9. Elaine H. Hage
10. Marcel G. Hage
11. Judith A. Martin
12. Margaret M. Saadi
13. Michael S. Sahady
14. Violet H. Sahady
15. Fares K. Stephen
16. Genevieve J. Trabulsi
17. Richard J. Trabulsi, Sr.
18. Clarence J. Shahid

TALKING POINTS

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 27, 1978

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JIM FALLOWS, HEATHER PARS ^{JL} ^{HP}

SUBJECT: Talking Points - Planting of a Cedars of
Lebanon Tree on the White House Grounds, 4/28/78

1. You will receive a briefing memo from Fran Voorde regarding the American Lebanese League and your personal history with it.
2. On December 15, 1977, you met with Elias T. Saadi (Chairman), and Paul A. Corey (President) of the American Lebanese League. The tree being planted today is the result of your affirmative response to their offer to present you with several biblically-famous Cedars of Lebanon trees. Two have been accepted, one of which is being planted today.
3. The Cedars of Lebanon are mentioned over 60 times in the bible:

"The just man shall flourish like a palm tree,
like a Cedar of Lebanon shall he grow." (Psalm 92/12)

This is the American Lebanese League's logo, and will be included in a program to be passed out at the ceremony:

"C E D A R S O F T H E L O R D

"Thus says the Lord God:

"I, too, will take from the crest of the cedar,
from its topmost branches tear off a tender shoot,
And plant it on a high and lofty mountain;
on the mountain heights of Israel I will plant it.

"It shall put forth branches and bear fruit,
and become a majestic cedar.
Birds of every kind shall dwell beneath it,
every winged thing in the shade of its boughs.
And all the trees of the field shall know that I,
the Lord,
Bring low the high tree,
lift the lowly tree,
Wither up the green tree,
and make the withered tree bloom."

(Ezekiel 17:22-24)

4. The Cedar has a reputation as an imperishable wood. It was the essential material for the temples and palaces of the ancient world. King Solomon took the Cedars of Lebanon from his friend and neighbor, King Hiram of Phoenicia to build the Temple in Jerusalem. In biblical days, its use was so widespread that the Babylonians and Assyrians referred to Lebanon as "Cedar Mountain". Christians and Moslems alike have all embraced these as symbols of timelessness and enduring strength. Today, there remains a grove of about 400 of these ancient Cedar trees (the largest of which is calculated to be over 2500 years old), on the western slopes of Mount Lebanon, northeast of Beirut.

5. When the Lebanese gained their independence in 1943, the Cedars of Lebanon were chosen as the national emblem for the Lebanese flag, symbolizing Lebanese solidarity against foreign domination.

6. This occasion is symbolic of the ongoing relationship between the Lebanese and the Americans, and their common goal of peace and goodwill among all peoples. Today, the Cedar provides inspiration to us as Americans and serves as a symbol of hope to the Lebanese people. This solid and incorruptable wood reminds us all that justice and righteousness are enduring.

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

The cedar of Lebanon is a splendid tree, an evergreen. It grows slowly to a huge size, and lives to an extremely old age. It produces wood which was highly valued by the master craftsmen of the ancient world, because of its rarity, and is priceless today.

The cedar of Lebanon is the national symbol of Lebanon. The groves of cedar on Mount Lebanon is "the cedar of the Lord". It is, therefore, fitting that on this beautiful spring day, the people of the United States manifest their warm and enduring friendship with the people of Lebanon. The planting of Lebanon's heritage on the grounds of the White House, where it will be viewed for years to come, will recall to all the strength and vitality of the association between our two republics.

Lebanon inspires a warm spirit in the hearts of Americans. It believes in freedom and parliamentary democracy. Its gifted and hard working people have made of Lebanon a model of progress and prosperity in an often-troubled part of the world. But the Lebanese agony in recent years has deeply saddened her friends in the United States.

There are few nations in the world which have come through the suffering that Lebanon has endured over the past several years. Families have been separated, friends have been divided, war and destruction have touched virtually every city, and there is probably no family in that land which has not been affected by the tragic events of the recent past.

We grieve for the loss of life and the damage to Lebanese society caused by the strife and fighting. It is our strongest hope that security and stability will be restored again~~st~~ throughout all of Lebanon.

We see this tree as a symbol of the inner strength which has permitted Lebanon to survive the tragedy of these years. We plant it today in the hope that this strength will prevail, that peace will return to this beautiful land and its people will be freed of the strife which has destroyed so many lives.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 28, 1978

Midge Costanza

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox. It is
forwarded to you for appropriate
handling.

Rick Hutcheson

cc: The First Lady

	FOR STAFFING
	FOR INFORMATION
✓	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND
	NO DEADLINE
	LAST DAY FOR ACTION -

ACTION
FYI

	ADMIN CONFID
	CONFIDENTIAL
	SECRET
	EYES ONLY

	VICE PRESIDENT
	EIZENSTAT
	JORDAN
	KRAFT
	LIPSHUTZ
	MOORE
	POWELL
	WATSON
	WEXLER
	BRZEZINSKI
	MCINTYRE
	SCHULTZE

	ADAMS
	ANDRUS
	BELL
	BERGLAND
	BLUMENTHAL
	BROWN
	CALIFANO
	HARRIS
	KREPS
	MARSHALL
	SCHLESINGER
	STRAUSS
	VANCE

	ARAGON
	BOURNE
	BUTLER
	H. CARTER
	CLOUGH
✓	COSTANZA
	CRUIKSHANK
	FALLOWS
✓	FIRST LADY
	GAMMILL
	HARDEN
	HUTCHESON
	JAGODA
	LINDER
	MITCHELL
	MOE
	PETERSON
	PETTIGREW
	PRESS
	SCHNEIDERS
	VOORDE
	WARREN
	WISE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 25, 1978

*Midge - ok -
get Maryann to
help
J*

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Margaret (Midge) Costanza *MCC*

RE: ERA Ratification

The attached memo from ERAmerica (Liz Carpenter) and the National Women's Political Caucus (Mildred Jeffrey) outlines an excellent plan of action for ERA ratification in Illinois. I support the plan as outlined.

May I proceed on your behalf to call the individuals named in the memo and begin implementing the plan?

April 19, 1978

TO: The President and Mrs. Carter

FROM: Liz Carpenter, Co-Chair, ERAmerica
Mildred Jeffrey, National Chair, National Women's
Political Caucus

RE: Ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment in Illinois

We have just been to Illinois for a brief visit and would like to share some findings with you. Illinois -- among all the unratified states -- holds the key to ratification at this time. If the Illinois legislature ratifies ERA this spring, we believe the necessary two more states can be won following the November elections, and we will at last have this simple and long-overdue issue behind us.

A vote in Illinois is likely to come during May or early June. The House will vote first. An ERA vote in the House in 1977 fell six votes short of the needed 107 (a 3/5's majority). Attached is a list of the 17 Democrats from Cook County who voted against ERA at that time. We are focusing on this group of legislators as the most likely and logical converts. Virtually all of them are "organization Democrats," responsive to Cook County Democratic Chairman George Dunne, Mayor Michael Bilandic, Richard Daley, Jr., and other Cook County Democratic leaders.

There is no question but that these leaders can bring about a successful vote in the House. While they have supported ERA with their words, we have yet to see demonstration of their actions.

It was humiliating, for example, that neither Mayor Bilandic nor his wife attended or sent greetings to an ERA fundraiser

staged by the Illinois Women's Political Caucus in Chicago last week-end. With the participation of top political and community leaders such as Marge Benton, Hope McCormick, Jayne Thompson (wife of the Republican governor), Senator Charles Percy, Sharon Percy Rockefeller, Helen Milliken (wife of the Michigan governor) and many others, the mayor's absence was noteworthy and embarrassing. The mayor serves on a special Task Force on the ERA at the U.S. Conference of Mayors. We know of nothing else he has done.

With regard to Mr. Dunne, he has publicly stated his support of ERA and was a sponsor of the Chicago fundraiser last week. Although he could not attend, he sent a statement expressing his support of the amendment.

We are pleased to report significant moves in the Catholic community toward uncoupling ERA and the abortion issue. This is critically important.

As you well know, Mr. President, Cook County is a push-button political situation, and it is vital that buttons get pushed right away. We have these firm suggestions and hope that there can be immediate follow-through by the persons mentioned.

- ** Could Secretary Joe Califano, a prominent Italian-American, and Secretary Pat Harris, a well-known and respected by many, both call Mayor Bilandic and George Dunne and express the need for cooperative spirit on the ERA, as one of the issues most important to your Administration?
- ** Could the Democratic National Committee, specifically John White, confer with George Dunne in the same vein, and could he also talk with City Councilman Vito Marzullo regarding five Italian representatives in Chicago who have voted against ERA (Laurino, Capparelli, DePrima, Nardulli, and Domico)? Marzullo has great influence but awaits Dunne's direction.
- ** Could Senator Kennedy be asked to call Cardinal Cody, Mayor Bilandic and George Dunne? These people need to know this is a prime issue with key Democratic party leaders.

- ** Could Midge Costanza call on Italian-Americans in the press and among Italian-American restaurateurs in Chicago who surely must be feeling the effects of the economic boycott on their business? Chicago is now losing over \$20 million annually in convention business.
- ** Could Speaker O'Neill be asked to enlist the aid of Congressman Dan Rostenkowski with Chicago Democrats with whom he is close and influential? In addition to several House Democrats, we are told this includes a recently appointed state senator, Hugh Ziomek.

Finally, Mr. President, we understand that you are planning to attend a Democratic fundraiser in Cook County in the coming weeks. May we suggest that there be an absolute guarantee from George Dunne that his considerable influence will be brought to bear on this issue in return for your participation in that event. The hard-ball politics of Cook County is well-known to you, Mr. President, and we are certain you understand that such a step could seal the ERA effort in the House and bring about a successful vote.

When the Illinois House passes the ERA, the Senate will then vote. At this time there is still uncertainty whether a three-fifths majority (36 votes) or a simple majority (30 votes) will be necessary. Again, the influence of George Dunne and other Democratic leaders will be crucial, along with the aid of Republican Governor James Thompson.

We believe that ratification in Illinois is long overdue and can happen this year. We are grateful to you and Mrs. Carter for all you have done on this issue, and believe that with your added efforts at this time, we can succeed at long last.

Thank you again.

ILLINOIS HOUSE

Cook County Democrats who voted No on ERA in 1977:

<u>District</u>	<u>Name</u>
5	Jack B. Williams
9	Richard F. Kelly, Jr.
15	William J. Laurino
16	Roman J. Kosinski
16	Ralph C. Capparelli
18	Lawrence DiPrima
18	Edward A. Doyle
19	Michael L. Nardulli
20	Marco Domico
20	Douglas Huff
23	Walter S. Kozubowski
23	John M. Vitek
25	Robert M. Terzich
26	James C. Taylor
27	John J. Beatty
30	Frank Giglio
30	Glenn Dawson
<u>(Absent)</u>	
25	Edmund E. Kornowicz
29	Raymond W. Ewell

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 28, 1978

Stu Eizenstat
Frank Moore
Landon Butler

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox. It is
forwarded to you for your
information.

Rick Hutcheson
CIVIL SERVICE REFORM

2233

	FOR STAFFING
	FOR INFORMATION
✓	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND
	NO DEADLINE
	LAST DAY FOR ACTION -

ACTION
FYI

	ADMIN CONFID
	CONFIDENTIAL
	SECRET
	EYES ONLY

	VICE PRESIDENT
✓	EIZENSTAT
	JORDAN
	KRAFT
	LIPSHUTZ
✓	MOORE
	POWELL
	WATSON
	WEXLER
	BRZEZINSKI
	MCINTYRE
	SCHULTZE

	ADAMS
	ANDRUS
	BELL
	BERGLAND
	BLUMENTHAL
	BROWN
	CALIFANO
	HARRIS
	KREPS
	MARSHALL
	SCHLESINGER
	STRAUSS
	VANCE

	ARAGON
	BOURNE
✓	BUTLER
	H. CARTER
	CLOUGH
	COSTANZA
	CRUIKSHANK
	FALLOWS
	FIRST LADY
	GAMMILL
	HARDEN
	HUTCHESON
	JAGODA
	LINDER
	MITCHELL
	MOE
	PETERSON
	PETTIGREW
	PRESS
	SCHNEIDERS
	VOORDE
	WARREN
	WISE

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON

C

April 26, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: RAY MARSHALL *for*
Secretary of Labor

SUBJECT: Civil Service Reform

I had a breakfast meeting today with Congressman Bill Ford on the labor relations proposal sent to the Hill yesterday as part of the Administration's Civil Service Reform effort.

I urged Bill's support of the proposal and emphasized the Administration's sense of urgency for moving the bill as quickly as possible. Ford was initially quite upset over the public identification of the proposal with AFGE, as there is a history of the Civil Service committees working with the independent unions as well as the AFL-CIO affiliates. Ford felt that the independents would be up-in-arms over our dealing solely with this one union.

Ford also believes that he was somewhat misled by the Administration. He indicated that he was under the impression that he, Bill Clay and Steve Solarz were to try to develop a consensus among the unions, in order to arrive at a united front in support of the Administration's labor relations proposal.

But with these concerns aside, he indicated, with certain caveats, a willingness to move ahead quickly to advance your proposals. These caveats can be categorized as both substantive and political.

First, from a substantive standpoint, many of the committee members believe that our proposal must be changed to include, at least, some type of union security provision and an expansion of the scope of collective bargaining. However, he indicated that this would not necessarily go as far as bargaining for pay. Apparently, many of the committee members have been on record for years in support of these

provisions and, therefore, would find it difficult to back away.

Ford's political concern was that many of the committee members have specific independent unions in their districts which are very powerful locally, even though they may not be as powerful when viewed in terms of their total numbers on a national basis. Therefore, any adverse reaction of the independents against the Administration's proposal because it is identified with AFGE will be difficult for them to handle.

Accordingly, Ford indicated that it was his view that the committee should take the Administration's proposal and, as a starting point, add to it a minimum number of provisions in developing a committee print. They would introduce that committee print without identifying it with H.R. 9094 or H.R. 13 or any other bill, but simply indicate it was a committee bill that then could be worked on and marked up. While one or two provisions might be unacceptable, Ford felt that this approach would be required for the bill to get out of committee. He indicated, of course, that those provisions undoubtedly would be under fire when they hit the House floor and probably some of them would drop by the wayside.

In terms of a timetable, Ford felt that the committee needed about two weeks to put together a committee print and to get into mark-up and that he would push for immediate action. His major concern is that we deescalate our public statements in connection with the new labor relations proposal and give them a period of relative quiet for two weeks to put the print together. After the print is ready, he thinks we should put on the pressure to move the bill through the committee quickly. He feels very strongly that at least one House must have completed its business on the bill before the end of June or it undoubtedly would not get through this session.

My recommendations are:

- 1) After the publicity of today, we should lower our press profile on the labor relations proposal.
- 2) We should indicate we are willing to let the committee work its will on the proposal, but that they should not expect the Administration to support any provisions

concerning expanded scope of bargaining or union security, once the bill hits the House floor. To do anything less is undoubtedly going to delay or perhaps kill the bill in committee.

- 3) We should continue to pursue with all House members the effort to get their committee peers to urge a mark-up as quickly as possible.

Pursuant to your request at the Cabinet meeting, I will be contacting the designated House members over the balance of the week. I, of course, will be available to assist Scotty Campbell in any way he feels might be helpful throughout the entire process and I will be in close touch with him.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
April 28, 1978

Hamilton Jordan

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox. It is
forwarded to you for your
information.

Rick Hutcheson

	FOR STAFFING
	FOR INFORMATION
/	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND
	NO DEADLINE
	LAST DAY FOR ACTION -

ACTION
FYI

	ADMIN CONFID
	CONFIDENTIAL
	SECRET
	EYES ONLY

	VICE PRESIDENT
	EIZENSTAT
/	JORDAN
	KRAFT
	LIPSHUTZ
	MOORE
	POWELL
	WATSON
	WEXLER
	BRZEZINSKI
	MCINTYRE
	SCHULTZE

	ARAGON
	BOURNE
	BUTLER
	H. CARTER
	CLOUGH
	COSTANZA
	CRUIKSHANK
	FALLOWS
	FIRST LADY
	GAMMILL
	HARDEN
	HUTCHESON
	JAGODA
	LINDER
	MITCHELL
	MOE
	PETERSON
	PETTIGREW
	PRESS
	SCHNEIDERS
	VOORDE
	WARREN
	WISE

	ADAMS
	ANDRUS
	BELL
	BERGLAND
	BLUMENTHAL
	BROWN
	CALIFANO
	HARRIS
	KREPS
	MARSHALL
	SCHLESINGER
	STRAUSS
	VANCE

C

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS
WASHINGTON

EYES ONLY

April 27, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Charlie Schultze

Subject: Consumer Prices in March CLS

The Bureau of Labor Statistics will release figures on the March CPI tomorrow (Friday, April 28) at 9:00 a.m. The news is not good.

The overall CPI went up 0.8 percent last month, compared with 0.6 percent in February and 0.8 percent in January. Food prices are the main source of the problem; they went up 1.3 percent in March (about the same as in January and February). Within the food area, meat prices are the principal culprit; they went up 3.2 percent further in March, and are now almost 9 percent above their December 1977 level. Sugar prices also rose sharply in March.

The rise of consumer prices excluding foods, however, was also disappointingly large last month -- 0.7 percent, compared with 0.5 percent in February. Apparel prices had declined in February, but they rose last month -- perhaps because price cutting ended as sales improved. Housing costs also rose faster last month. Residential gas and electricity rates have increased sharply in both of the past two months, reflecting cold weather and the coal strike.

During the past three months, consumer prices other than food and energy -- a measure of the underlying rate of inflation -- have been rising at an annual rate of about 7-3/4 percent. This is far above the pace that prevailed during the latter half of 1977. It is too early, however, to conclude that a serious acceleration of prices is underway. For example, the rise of consumer prices excluding food and fuel also accelerated sharply -- to an 8 percent annual rate -- in the first three months of last year, and then subsided again.

Since wage rates this year are going up faster than a year ago, a worsening of the underlying rate of inflation may have occurred. We must be prepared, in any event, to see some rather bad news for both food and nonfood prices over the next few months.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

28 April 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

RICK HUTCHESON *R.H.*

SUBJECT:

Status of Presidential Requests

VICE PRESIDENT:

1. (4/17) Please call Marian Edelman and Coretta King regarding the Head Start Program in the Department of Education -- In Progress, (calls by the Vice President's staff to Edelman have not changed her mind; Stu will call Mrs. King this week).

CHARLES WARREN:

1. (4/12) Work with Jim Fallowson the Solar Energy Speech -- In Progress, (for Western trip).

KRAFT:

1. (4/10) Work out a time for the President to see Giscard -- Not to be scheduled, (per Brzezinski and Kraft). *done*
2. (4/24) (Voorde) Let Frank work out a Presidential message or a Vice Presidential trip regarding the West Virginia State Society Dinner honoring Sen. Byrd on 5/17 -- Message Conveyed, (Presidential message to be sent).
3. (4/24) Talk over the invitation to the Correspondents Dinner/National Association for Equal Education Opportunity and Federation of Democratic Women's Banquet for Saturday night and get back to the President -- Done. *done*
4. (4/25) Get comments to the President from State, NSC, etc. on the option on the trip to Panama re: a) whether to go; b) when to go; and c) how big an event -- Done. *done*

STRAUSS:

1. (4/20) Talk to Ed Muskie regarding the environment vs. inflation -- Done. *done*

SECRETARY SCHLESINGER:

1. (4/24) (and McIntyre, Eizenstat) Please advise the President briefly on Sen. Haskell's bill regarding demonstration tests for oil shale -- Done. *done*

BOURNE:

1. (4/26) Prepare brief reply for the President to sign to Mrs. Rusche of Atlanta concerning drug abuse of young children (brought to the President by Walt Russell)-- Done. *done*

MOORE:

1. (4/6) (and the Vice President) Check with Pat Harris on the Tennessee Director concerning the Knoxville UDAG grant -- In Progress, (Frank will talk with Pat Harris).
2. (4/6) See Jim Gammill regarding Malcolm Reese. Comply with Sen. Nunn's request that Reese serve at either SBA or Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Atlanta or Washington -- In Progress, (with FHLBB; Nunn, Reese and Dan Tate to meet 5/1 to discuss it).
3. (4/12) Get a reply from McIntyre concerning the letter from Sen. Williams about the VA hospital in Camden, N.J. -- Done. *done*
4. (4/14) Set up a meeting for Dee Huddleston and Administration officials regarding intelligence charter -- Done. *done*
5. (4/22) (and Jordan) The President is particularly eager to see that those Senators who voted for the treaties be re-elected. Give the President an individual assessment of what we can do to help them -- Done. *done*
6. (4/26) The President has read the letter from Sen. Melcher concerning the magnetohydrodynamics process

for converting coal into electricity. Prepare a non-com reply for the President -- Done.

done

EIZENSTAT:

1. (4/12) (and McIntyre) Expedite Pension Commission -- In Progress, (Executive Order expected 5/5, Commission members to be selected by mid-summer).
2. (4/21) Comment; the President wants to hold to maximum deregulation and minimum budget costs, and is willing to fight it out with Congress -- In Progress, (expected 5/3).
3. (4/24) Expedite water policy; it's already two months overdue -- Done.

done

	FOR STAFFING
	FOR INFORMATION
✓	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND
	NO DEADLINE
	LAST DAY FOR ACTION -

ACTION
FYI

	ADMIN CONFID
	CONFIDENTIAL
	SECRET
	EYES ONLY

	VICE PRESIDENT
	EIZENSTAT
	JORDAN
	KRAFT
	LIPSHUTZ
	MOORE
	POWELL
	WATSON
	WEXLER
	BRZEZINSKI
	MCINTYRE
	SCHULTZE

	ADAMS
	ANDRUS
	BELL
	BERGLAND
	BLUMENTHAL
	BROWN
	CALIFANO
	HARRIS
	KREPS
	MARSHALL
	SCHLESINGER
	STRAUSS
	VANCE

	ARAGON
	BOURNE
	BUTLER
	H. CARTER
✓	CLOUGH
	COSTANZA
	CRUIKSHANK
	FALLOWS
	FIRST LADY
	GAMMILL
	HARDEN
✓	HUTCHESON
	JAGODA
	LINDER
	MITCHELL
	MOE
	PETERSON
	PETTIGREW
	PRESS
	SCHNEIDERS
	VOORDE
	WARREN
	WISE

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

please send me cc

thanks -- ssc

Harold Volkmer

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Civil Service

Energy

Tax Reform

Hosp Cost

Airline Dereg

M. & E Arms Sales

Turkey Arms Embargo

Hold on budget

Anti-inflation

10:00 AM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 28, 1978

MEETING WITH THE 95th NEW MEMBERS CAUCUS

Monday, May 1, 1978

10:00 a.m. (20 minutes)

The Cabinet Room

From: Frank Moore *FM*

I. PURPOSE

To discuss the upcoming campaigns and the balance of the legislative calendar.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS, AND PRESS PLAN

Background: Rep. Harold Volkmer (D-9-Mo) is the Chairman of this group. He will be stressing the desire of the Members to cooperate and coordinate with you during the coming months; both legislatively and politically. Many of these Members face tough reelections and will be looking to you for help in getting reelected. Attached is a compendium of appearances by Administration officials on behalf of Members of the New Members Caucus.

Participants: See attached list.

Press Plan: White House Photographer.

III. TALKING POINTS

- **Explain that you consider yourself and the Members present to have faced the same frustrations in the 1½ years since being elected. Explain that you have found it is difficult for the government to respond, even to you, and you understand how difficult it must be for them.
- **Explain how you have learned a lot from the experiences of the past 16 months and you presume they have learned a lot also. You both have made mistakes, but learned from them for the future.

****Briefly touch upon your legislative priorities for the balance of the year with regard to energy, civil service reform, tax reform, and fighting inflation (hospital cost containment and airline deregulation). Tell them you are looking for their help in getting these important pieces of legislation enacted.**

****You should mention our plans for helping candidates in 1978. Explain that Frank Moore is coordinating the schedules of about 100 Administration spokesmen to make sure that the marginal races and our key supporters are the ones getting the most help. You have asked Members of the Cabinet and others to make themselves available for two trips out of Washington per month.**

Harold - trust - improvement

Ike - App'ts = Cabinet → WH = Inflation & Bureaucracy

Pan - Civ Serv - Veterans - Capital Crisis - ++

- Wes - Early supporter now frustrated =

Rahall - Energy - Miners health - ~~they~~ Black lung regs
Appal. highways

+ Don - Ohio -

H2O policy

Dale

Deaf of Nat Geo

Senate inaction = Nat Geo - Civ Service

Leon

Dept liaison - be strong

OSHA = Constrain bureaucracy

SOLAR

MEETING WITH 95th NEW MEMBERS CAUCUS--ADDENDUM I

Over the past two months the Campaign Scheduling Committee in my office has been tracking and targeting Congressional races and arranging appearances by Administration officials on behalf of those candidates whom we consider to be marginal. The following report lists the members of the New Members Caucus, their Administration support scores, their primary dates and the events at which we have arranged to have Administration officials appear on behalf of each member. The listing is divided into two sections. The first section consists of those members whose seats, at this time, appear to be marginal. The second division consists of the remaining members of the Caucus.

I. Marginal members of the Caucus

Joe Ammerman (23rd PA) 96% support May 16 uncontested primary

--18 April '78: Ambassador Strauss appeared at a luncheon in State College, PA.

Dave Bonior (12th MI) 87% support August 8 uncontested primary

--30 March '78: The Vice President spoke at a luncheon in Detroit.

--20 April '78: Secretary Marshall appeared at a press briefing, a reception and an open forum in Mt. Clemens, MI.

John Cavanaugh (2nd NE) 88% support May 9 uncontested primary

--28 March '78: Jody Powell appeared before the Nebraska Press Association in Omaha.

David Cornwell (8th IN) 78% support May 2 uncontested primary

--10 June '78: Chip Carter will do an afternoon reception in Evansville.

--23 June '78: Max Cleland (VA) will appear before a Veterans group.

Alan Ertel (17th PA) 71% support May 16 uncontested primary

--21 February '78: The Congressman visited with the First Lady while she was in Harrisburg.

Bob Gammage (22nd TX) 38% support May 6 contested primary

--26 April '78: Secretary Adams attended a fundraiser in Houston.

Lamar Gudger (11th NC) 57% support May 2 contested primary

Jerry Huckaby (5th LA) 22% support September 16 contested
primary

Pete Kostmayer (8th PA) 91% support May 16 contested but not
significant primary

--21 May '78: Secretary Harris will visit Philadelphia on Kostmayer's behalf.

--Was offered the Vice President for May 21 but felt that the timing was not opportune.

Tom Luken (2nd OH) 64% support June 6 uncontested primary

--21 December '78: The Vice President attended a fundraiser in Cincinnati.

--5 May '78: Secretary Marshall attended a D.C. fundraiser.

--11 May '78: Jim Fallows will hold a meeting with local press in Cincinnati.

Jim Mattox (5th TX) 71% support May 6 uncontested primary

--19 September '78: The Vice President attended a fundraiser in D.C.

--6 December '78: Frank Moore and Hamilton Jordan attended a fundraiser in Dallas.

--15 March '78: Mrs. Mondale attended a meeting of the Democratic Women's Club in Dallas.

--12 May '78: Jack Watson will do an event in Dallas.

Leon Panetta (16th CA) 80% support June 6 uncontested primary

--26 February '77: Assistant Secretary Mercure (Agriculture) held a meeting with farmers on the draught situation in Fresno, CA and in San Francisco.

--13 April '77: Secretary Bergland attended a barbeque in Salinas.

- 8 October '77: The Vice President attended a fundraiser in Monterey.
- 30 March '78: Vernon Weaver (SBA) attended a small business conference in Monterey.
- 31 March '78: Secretary Andrus attended a fundraiser in Monterey.
- 25 April '78: Jim McIntyre (OMB) visited an agriculture group in Salinas.
- Harold Volkmer (9th MO) 69% support August 8 contested primary
- 9 December '77: Secretary Bergland toured and met with the press in Hannibal, MO.

Doug Walgren (18th PA) 89% support May 16 uncontested primary

- 18 April '78: Ambassador Strauss attended a fundraiser and held a meeting with steel executives.
- 27 April '78: Secretaries Califano, Schlesinger and Adams attended a D.C. fundraiser.

Robert Young (2nd MO) 67% support August 8 uncontested primary

- 13 March '78: Frank Moore did a television segment with the Congressman.

II. Non-marginal members of the Caucus for whom we have arranged Administration appearances.

Dan Glickman (4th KS) 72% support August 1 uncontested primary

- 23 September '77: Secretary Bergland attended a DNC event in Wichita.
- 29 September '77: The Vice President attended a fundraiser in D.C.
- 18 April '78: Langhorne Bond toured aircraft manufacturing plants in Wichita.
- 16 June '78: Val Pinson will attend a "roast" for the Congressman in Wichita.

Andy Ireland (8th FL) 47% support September 12 uncontested primary

- 31 March '78: Ambassador Strauss attended a fundraiser in Sarasota, FL.

Dale Kildee (7th MI) 91% support August 8 uncontested primary

--17 February '78: Vernon Weaver attended a small business conference in Flynt.

Barbara Mikulski (3rd MD) 93% support September 12 uncontested primary

--30 March '77: Secretary Harris attended a meeting of the National Women's Political Caucus.

--5 May '78: Ambassador Strauss will do a fundraiser in Baltimore.

Jim Guy Tucker (2nd AR) 81% support May 30 uncontested primary

--8 March '77: Secretary Bergland visited the Congressman's District.

--9 September '77: Secretary Marshall did a television taping.

--24 September '77: Secretary Schlesinger did a television taping.

--6 April '78: Bill Cox, Federal Highway Administrator, visited the District.

PARTICIPANTS

The President
Frank Moore
Bill Cable
Bob Beckel
Jim Free
Valerie Pinson
Richard Pettigrew

MEMBERS OF 95th NEW MEMBERS CAUCUS

Dan Akaka (D-2-Hawaii)
Joe Ammerman (D-23-Pa)
Doug Applegate (D-18-Ohio)
Tony Beilenson (D-23-Calif)
Dave Bonior (D-12-Mich)
John Cavanaugh (D-2-Nebr)
David Cornwell (D-8-Ind)
Baltasar Corrada (Resident
Commissioner-Puerto Rico)
Allen Ertel (D-17-Pa)
Billy Lee Evans (D-8-Ga)
Ronnie Flippo (D-5-Ala)
Bob Gammage (D-22-Texas)
Dick Gephardt (D-3-Mo)
Dan Glickman (D-4-Kans)
Al Gore (D-4-Tenn)
Cec Heftel (D-1-Hawaii)
Jerry Huckaby (D-5-La)
Andy Ireland (D-8-Fla)
Dale Kildee (D-7-Mich)
Peter Kostmayer (D-8-Pa)
Edward Markey (D-7-Mass)
Jim Mattox (D-5-Texas)
Barbara Mikulski (D-3-MD)
Ozzie Myers (D-1-Pa)
Leon Panetta (D-16-Calif)
Don Pease (D-13-Ohio)
Nick Joe Rahall (D-4-W.Va.)
Ike Skelton (D-4-Mo)
Bob Stump (D-3-Ariz)
Bruce Vento (D-4-Minn)
Harold Volkmer (D-9-Mo)
Doug Walgren (D-18-Pa)
Wes Watkins (D-3-Okla)
Ted Weiss (D-20-NY)
Bob Young (D-2-Mo)

95th NEW MEMBERS CAUCUS

Dan Akaka (D-2-Hawaii). Committees: Agriculture (#29), Merchant Marine and Fisheries (#28). Administration support: 87.2%. Wife: Mary.

Joe Ammerman (D-23-Pa). Committees: Agriculture (#26), House Administration (#17). Administration Support: 95.7%.

Doug Applegate (D-18-Ohio). Committees: District of Columbia (#13), Public Works & Transportation (#29), Veterans Affairs (#18). Administration support: 66%. Wife: Betty.

Tony Beilenson (D-23-Calif). Committees: International Relations (#21), Judiciary (#23), Science & Technology (#24). Administration Support: 90.2%. Wife: Dolores.

Dave Bonior (D-12-Mich). Committees: Merchant Marine & Fisheries (#27), Public Works & Transportation (#23). Administration Support: 87.2%. Wife: Sybil.

John Cavanaugh (D-2-Nebr). Committees: Banking, Finance & Urban Affairs (#27), International Relations (#25). Administration Support: 88.4%. Wife: Kathleen.

David Cornwell (D-8-Ind). Committee: Public Works & Transportation (#21). Administration Support: 77.8%. Wife: Jane.

Baltasar Corrada (Resident Commissioner/Puerto Rico). Committees: Education and Labor (#24), Interior & Insular Affairs (#27). Wife: Beatriz.

Allen Ertel (D-17-Pa). Committees: Judiciary (#21), Public Works & Transportation (#24). Administration Support: 71.1%. Wife: Catharine.

Billy Lee Evans (D-8-Ga). Committees: Judiciary (#22), Public Works & Transportation (#25). Administration Support: 48.8%. Wife: April.

Ronnie Flippo (D-5-Ala). Committees: Public Works & Transportation (#26), Science & Technology (#21). Administration Support: 50%. Wife: Faye.

Bob Gammage (D-22-Texas). Committees: Interstate & Foreign Commerce (#27), Science & Technology (#23). Administration Support: 37.5%. Wife: Judy Ann.

Dick Gephardt (D-3-Mo). Committee: Ways & Means (#23). Administration Support: 87.2%. Wife: Jane.

Dan Glickman (D-4-Kans). Committees: Agriculture (#28), Science & Technology (#22). Administration Support: 71.7%.
Wife: Rhoda.

Al Gore (D-4-Tenn). Committees: Interstate & Foreign Commerce (#28), Science & Technology (#25). Administration Support: 71.7%.
Wife: Tipper.

Cec Heftel (D-1-Hawaii). Committees: Education & Labor (#23), Post Office & Civil Service (#14). Administration Support: 88.1%. Wife: Joyce.

Jerry Huckaby (D-5-La). Committees: Agriculture (#27), Interior & Insular Affairs (#31). Administration Support: 21.7%.
Wife: Sue.

Andy Ireland (D-8-Fla). Committees: International Relations (#19), Small Business (#22). Administration Support: 46.5%.
Wife: Diana.

Dale Kildee (D-7-Mich). Committees: Education & Labor (#25), Small Business (#23). Administration Support: 91.3%.
Wife: Gayle.

Peter Kostmayer (D-8-Pa). Committees: Government Operations (#28), Interior & Insular Affairs (#26). Administration Support: 91.3%.

Edward Markey (D-7-Mass). Committees: Interior & Insular Affairs (#25), Interstate & Foreign Commerce (#24). Administration Support: 93.6%.

Jim Mattox (D-5-Texas). Committees: Banking, Finance & Urban Affairs (#29), Budget (#17). Administration Support: 71.1%.

Barbara Mikulski (D-3-Md). Committees: Interstate & Foreign Commerce (#29), Merchant Marine & Fisheries (#26). Administration Support: 93.5%.

Ozzie Myers (D-1-Pa). Committees: Education & Labor (#19), Post Office & Civil Service (#13). Administration Support: 76.7%.
Wife: Essie.

Leon Panetta (D-16-Calif). Committees: Agriculture (#24), House Administration (#16). Administration Support: 80%.
Wife: Sylvia.

Don Pease (D-13-Ohio). Committee: International Relations (#20). Administration Support: 89.4%. Wife: Jeanne.

Nick Joe Rahall (D-4-W.Va.). Committees: Interior & Insular Affairs (#29), Public Works & Transportation (#27). Administration Support: 79.1%. Wife: Helen.

Ike Skelton (D-4-Mo). Committees: Agriculture (#25), Small Business (#24). Administration Support: 52.2%. Wife: Susan.

Bob Stump (D-3-Arizona). Committee: Public Works & Transportation (#28). Administration Support: 12.5%.

Bruce Vento (D-4-Minn). Committees: Banking, Finance & Urban Affairs (#30), Interior & Insular Affairs (#30). Administration Support: 95.7%. Wife: Mary Jean.

Harold Volkmer (D-9-Mo). Committees: Agriculture (#30), Judiciary (#18). Administration Support: 68.9%. Wife: Shirley. Rep. Volkmer is the CHAIRMAN of the 95th New Members Caucus.

Doug Walgren (D-18-Pa). Committees: Interstate & Foreign Commerce (#26), Science & Technology (#20). Administration Support: 88.6%. Wife: Carmala.

Wes Watkins (D-3-Okla). Committees: Banking, Finance & Urban Affairs (#32), Science & Technology (#26). Administration Support: 16.3%. Wife: Lou.

Ted Weiss (D-20-NY). Committees: Education & Labor (#22), Government Operations (#29). Administration Support: 91.3%.

Bob Young (D-2-Mo). Committees: Public Works & Transportation (#22), Science & Technology (#27). Administration Support: 67.4%. Wife: Irene.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT
GROUP AVERAGE=68.78%

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 28, 1978

Frank Moore

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox. It is
forwarded to you for appropriate
handling.

Rick Hutcheson

RE: REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

2230

	FOR STAFFING
	FOR INFORMATION
/	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND
	NO DEADLINE
	LAST DAY FOR ACTION -

ACTION
FYI

	ADMIN CONFID
	CONFIDENTIAL
	SECRET
	EYES ONLY

	VICE PRESIDENT
	EIZENSTAT
	JORDAN
	KRAFT
	LIPSHUTZ
/	MOORE
	POWELL
	WATSON
	WEXLER
	BRZEZINSKI
	MCINTYRE
	SCHULTZE

	ADAMS
	ANDRUS
	BELL
	BERGLAND
	BLUMENTHAL
	BROWN
	CALIFANO
	HARRIS
	KREPS
	MARSHALL
	SCHLESINGER
	STRAUSS
	VANCE

	ARAGON
	BOURNE
	BUTLER
	H. CARTER
	CLOUGH
	COSTANZA
	CRUIKSHANK
	FALLOWS
	FIRST LADY
	GAMMILL
	HARDEN
	HUTCHESON
	JAGODA
	LINDER
	MITCHELL
	MOE
	PETERSON
	PETTIGREW
	PRESS
	SCHNEIDERS
	VOORDE
	WARREN
	WISE

9:15 AM

Frank -
7 will
support
J

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 26, 1978

MEETING WITH REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 27, 1978

9:15 A.M. (20 minutes)

Cabinet Room

From: Frank Moore

by Lee Frances

I. PURPOSE

To meet with Republican Members of the Committee and emphasize that Civil Service reform is a major Presidential priority, and encourage these Members to report the bill in time for 1978 House action.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS, AND PRESS PLAN

A. Background

Your meetings with -- and phone calls to -- the Democratic Members of the P.O. & C.S. Committee within the past several days, convinced them that the Administration is genuinely serious about this legislation, that you want positive action this year. Furthermore, we have elicited a commitment from a majority of the Committee to try to report out a bill as soon as possible. In some ways, the Administration has more trouble with the Democrats on the Committee than with the Republicans. Some of the Republicans have concerns over specific provisions in the bill but their concerns are not a stumbling block to getting Committee action by early June. "Scotty" Campbell has met with the Republicans as a group and the Administration team has had continuous and frequent contact with Republicans individually.

B. Participants

1. Ed Derwinski (Ill.): Ranking Minority. Derwinski takes great delight in saying that he's the Administration's strongest supporter on this Committee. He is a strong supporter for Civil

Service reform and has been fairly consistent in supporting the Administration's position on other legislation. Most Republicans on the Committee will follow his lead on strategy; however, he does not impose his position on the Republican Members and they are free to take individual and different stands on policy issues.

2. John Rousselot (Calif): Very conservative. One of the four "official Republican objectors" on the House floor. He is somewhat unpredictable on the Committee but is supportive in Civil Service reform.
3. Jim Collins (Texas): Does not take an active role in Committee matters and seldom is present at Committee meetings. However, he can be counted on when he's needed. He supports the Senior Executive Service (though he says they all ought to be political appointees) and privately doesn't think the Administration is going far enough in changes relative to Veterans Preference (though, from a political standpoint, he will probably have trouble voting for the changes we have recommended).
4. Gene Taylor (Missouri): Actively participated in the Committee's past investigations of personnel abuses of the former Administration and is generally supportive of Civil Service reform. He has a particular problem with some personnel matters in the Department of Agriculture and his attitude on the Civil Service reform is influenced by it.
5. Ben Gilman (N.Y.): Gilman has focused almost exclusively on the Veterans Preference issue in the Civil Service reform bill and is probably the only absolute "No" vote on the bill -- unless Veterans Preference is dropped. He does have some support for his position from Taylor and Lott -- but we're not sure that their support of his position would cause them to vote "No".
6. Trent Lott (Mississippi): Very bright. Has been very active and interested in Civil Service legislation and is a strong supporter. He has a proportionately large civil service work force in his district and works very hard for his constituents.

7. Jim Leach (Iowa): Very supportive of Civil Service reform -- would be interested in expanding some of the provisions.
8. Tom Corcoran (Ill): Positive attitude although has some reservations about the Veterans Preference. He has no problem in moving the proposal this year and is sympathetic to that.

C. Press Plan

White House photographer only.

III. TALKING POINTS AND MAJOR ISSUES

Labor-Management Relations. The labor issue is clearly the most troublesome for the Republicans to support. They will not strongly oppose the Administration in Committee on the labor-management title presented yesterday. They will be aligned with the Chamber of Commerce, Business Roundtable, CED, and other management groups in that we have not lost their support for Civil Service reform by proposing that the Executive Order program be enacted into law. They will undoubtedly work on a strategy on the floor to blunt any strong labor provisions in the bill.

Veterans Preference. The bill will enhance the rights of veterans who really need help -- disabled and Vietnam veterans -- but would reduce or eliminate rights of other groups with less need for protection -- non-disabled veterans and military retirees. These changes are needed to focus adjustment assistance on groups in most severe need, to restore needed flexibility in staffing decisions, and to redress the balance of opportunities available to non-veterans, especially women and minorities.

General. This issue is not a partisan one. It enjoys support from both sides of the aisle and is "good politics" for Republicans and Democrats alike.